



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,014	06/20/2003	Avijit Chatterjee	ROC920030209US1	8483
46797	7590	01/16/2009		
IBM CORPORATION, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT 917, BLDG. 006-1 3605 HIGHWAY 52 NORTH ROCHESTER, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER LIN, SHEW FEN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2166	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/16/2009	PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/600,014	<b>Applicant(s)</b> CHATTERJEE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> SHEW-FEN LIN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2166	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 13 and 17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 12, 13, 17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- a. This action is taken to response to Request for Continued Examination filed on 10/22/2008.
- b. Claims 12-13 and 17 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 12-13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bays et al. (US Patent 6,519,603, hereinafter "Bays") in view of Wynblatt et al. (US Patent 6,871,318).

**As to claim 12**, Bays discloses a method of creating annotations for a plurality of different type data objects manipulated by user (Figs. 4-5, col. 2, lines 13-21, col. 5, lines 31-33), comprising:

receiving, from the user, a selected role in which the user has chosen to act (Fig. 3A, col. 3, lines 5-34, col. 8, lines 29-30, select a context [role]);

receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object (Figs. 3A, 4), wherein the data object is identified by a set of identifying parameters (Fig. 3A, col. 2, lines 29-37, col. 3, lines 48-58, the type of annotatable data item is identified, such as rows of table x, or cell in a spreadsheet);

presenting, to the user, a plurality of annotation structures based on the selected role and the set of identifying parameters (Figs. 2, 4, col. 5, lines 25-31, col. 8, lines 27-35, col. 9, lines 43-45), wherein each annotation structure defines one or more annotation fields (Figs. 2, 4, col. 2, lines 38-46, col. 7, lines 43-55), ;

receiving, from the user, a selection of one of the plurality of annotation structures (Figs. 3A/3B, 6, col. 2, line 47 to col. 3, line 4);

generating a graphical user interface allowing entry of the one or more annotation fields (Figs. 2, 4, col. 7, lines 9-14, lines 51-55);

creating an annotation record, via the graphical user interface, for the one or more annotation fields (Fig. 1A, item 20, col. 6, lines 35-36, col. 7, lines 43-55, col. 8, lines 4-26).

Bays does not explicitly disclose creating an index based on the set of identifying parameters and creating an annotation record comprising the index.

Wynblatt discloses creating an index based on the set of identifying parameters and creating an annotation record comprising the index (Figs. 3-5, col. 4, lines 2-15, col. 5, lines 49-67, The annotation file entry is indexed by the unique ID of each document included within the annotation. These IDs can be extracted directly from the NEW\_DOCUMENT events in the annotation file).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to combine Bays and Wynblatt because both references are related to annotation management, and by including indexing annotation with document ID as disclosed in Wynblatt, to provide dynamic annotation and hyperlinks to existing annotation (Wynblatt, col. 2, lines 43-52, col. 4, lines 32-34). It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to index annotation based on the data item to be annotated.

**As to claim 13**, Bays discloses the method of claim 12, further comprising storing the annotation record in an annotation store separate from the annotated data object (annotation store, Figures 1 and 3, column 7, lines 28-39, annotations are stored in a separate database 20).

**As to claim 17**, Bays discloses the method of claim 12, further comprising generating a graphical user interface for displaying the annotation information, wherein the annotation information presented to the user in the graphical user interface is dependent on the selected role (Fig. 2, col. 3, lines 10-14, col. 7, lines 9-14, col. 8, lines 27-35, col. 9, lines 47-49).

***Response to Amendment and Remarks***

Applicant's remarks have been fully and carefully considered.

Applicant argues that Bays does not disclose presenting, to the user, a plurality of annotation structures based on the selected role **and the set of identifying parameters**, wherein each annotation structure defines one or more annotation input fields. Neither Figure 2, Figure 4, Column 5: Lines 25-31, Column 8: Lines 27- 35, or Column 9: Lines 43-45 of Bays disclose that the plurality of annotation structures presented to the user are based on the index or object identifiers such as a relational table or spreadsheet, a row within the table, a cell within the table, and the like. In fact, Applicants submit that the annotation structures presented to the user in Bays are not based on the index or object identifiers in any way.

The examiner respectfully disagrees.

Bays describes “annotations with a generic structure or a more specific structure, where the structure can depend on the nature of the data being annotated and the context of the author of the annotation”, (see Bays col. 5, lines 25-31).

Bays further discloses “An annotatable data item (i.e. the subsection of database material that can be annotated) is any entity referenced by an index (e.g. by an object identifier) or any attribute or subcomponent of such an entity, or any arbitrary set of such items. Examples include a table such as a relational table or spreadsheet, a view such as a relational view, a row within a table, a cell within a table (i.e. the intersection of a column and a row), a column within a table, an object, an attribute of an object, a set of rows or columns from one table, or a set of rows from different tables.”, (see Bays, col. 2, lines 16-29).

Examiner has interpreted the above disclosure such that an annotatable item referenced by an index, e.g. a cell within a table (i.e. the intersection of a column and a row) as refers to

Art Unit: 2166

Applicant's specification pages 2-3, paragraph [0006]: ... parameters (location, table, row, and column) is an annotation structure (e.g. annotatable item) based on (e.g. referenced by) a set of identifying parameters (e.g. a column and a row).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shew-Fen Lin whose telephone number is 571-272-2672. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM - 5:00PM.

Art Unit: 2166

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 571-272-3978. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Shew-Fen Lin /S. L./  
Examiner, Art Unit 2166  
January 13, 2009

/Hosain T Alam/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166